



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/557,351

11/18/2005

Masaaki Mori

64476NAT(46342)

1752

21874

7590

04/02/2009

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE LLP

P.O. BOX 55874

BOSTON, MA 02205

EXAMINER

PAK, MICHAEL D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1646

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/02/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/557,351	Applicant(s) MORI ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael Pak	Art Unit 1646	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2,4, 14-39 and 43-66 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-13 and 40-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11-18-05; 5-31-07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-42, SEQ ID NO:4, species 1st through 3rd amino acid residue, gastric hyper acidity, antibody against N-terminal portion, in the reply filed on January 29, 2009 is acknowledged.

Applicant indicated that claims 1-14, 17-27 and 40-42 read on the elected species. However, claims 2 is withdrawn because the claim is drawn to 1st-13th amino acid species. Furthermore, claims 4, 14-39 are drawn to the C-terminus.

Claims 1, 3, 5-13 and 40-42 are examined below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1, 3, 5-13 and 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for an antibody generated against peptide of at least 6 amino acids, does not reasonably provide enablement for antibody generated against a peptide of 3 amino acid. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The first paragraph of § 112 requires that the patent specification enable "those skilled in the art how to make and use the full scope of the claimed invention without

Art Unit: 1646

undue experimentation." Genentech, Inc. v. Novo Nordisk AIS, 108 F.3d 1361, 1365, 42 USPQ2d 1001, 1004 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (quoting In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)); see also In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). ("[T]he scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation to the scope of enablement provided by the specification to persons of ordinary skill in the art."). Whether making and using the invention would have required undue experimentation, and thus whether the disclosure is enabling is a legal conclusion based upon several underlying factual inquiries. See In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 735, 736-37, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1402, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As set forth in Wands, the factors to be considered in determining whether a claimed invention is enabled throughout its scope without undue experimentation include the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in the art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and the breadth of the claims.

Likewise, in Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharm. Co., 927 F.2d 1200, 18 USPQ2d 1016 (Fed. Cir. 1991), the court affirmed the holding of invalidity of claims to analogs of the EPO gene under § 112 for lack of enablement where applicants had claimed every possible analog of the EPO gene but had disclosed only how to make EPO and a very few analogs. "[D]espite extensive statements in the specification concerning all analogs of the EPO gene that can be made, there is little enabling disclosure of the particular analogs and how to make them There may be many other genetic sequences that

Art Unit: 1646

code for EPO-type products. Amgen has told how to make and use only a few of them and is therefore not entitled to claim all of them." *Id.*, 927 F.2d at 1213-14, 18 USPQ2d at 1027.

Claims encompass antibody against peptide consisting of three amino acids. However, one skilled in the art cannot make and use antibody peptide consisting of three amino acids because the minimum epitope required is at least six amino acids. The amount of direction provided in the specification is limited to antibodies generated against larger peptide. One skilled in the art would require empirical experimentation in order to determine the method required to generate antibody against a peptide consisting of three amino acids. However, the specification does not teach how to make such antibodies. Antibodies generation requires a peptide with at least 6 amino acid epitope (Harlaw et al., *Antibodies, a laboratory Manual*, Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, 1988, page 76). No working example is provided to generate antibodies against a peptide consisting of three amino acids. In view of the extent and the unpredictability of the experimentation required to practice the invention as claimed, one skilled in the art could not make the invention without undue experimentation. Therefore, based on the above Wands analysis, a preponderance of the evidence supports a conclusion that one skilled in the art would not have been enabled to make and use the claimed invention without undue experimentation.

3. Claims 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable

Art Unit: 1646

one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

A deposit of the cell AhW23N2G6D1 and AhW23N3H3E4 is required to enable the invention of claims 8 and 11. It does not appear that a cell possessing the identical structure and functional properties of AhW23N2G6D1 and AhW23N3H3E4 is known and publicly available or can be reproducibly isolated. Without a publicly available deposit of the above cell line, one of ordinary skill in the art could not be assured of the ability to practice the invention as claimed. Exact replication of the claimed cell which produces a chemically and functionally distinct SDH is an unpredictable event. The claimed cell is a distinct and unique cell, and one of ordinary skill in the art would therefore be required to engage in undue experimentation in order to make the claimed cell line species in view of the lack of exemplary materials and in view of the unpredictability associated with obtaining the exact species repeatedly. A suitable deposit for patent purposes is required.

If a deposit is made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, then an affidavit or declaration by Applicants or someone associated with the patent owner who is in a position to make such assurances, or a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature, stating (a) that the deposit has been made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty; and (b) that all restrictions imposed by the depositor on the availability to the public of the deposited material will be irrevocably removed upon the granting of a patent, would satisfy the deposit requirements. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.808. If a deposit is not made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, then the

requirements may be satisfied by an affidavit or declaration by Applicants or someone associated with the patent owner who is in a position to make such assurances, or by a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature, stating that the deposit has been made at an acceptable depository and establishing that the following criteria have been met: (a) during the pendency of the application, access to the deposit will be afforded to one determined by the Commissioner to be entitled thereto; (b) all restrictions imposed by the depositor on the availability to the public of the deposited material will be irrevocably removed upon the granting of a patent; (c) the deposit will be maintained for a term of at least thirty (30) years and at least five (5) years after the most recent request for the furnishing of a sample of the deposited material; (d) a viability statement in accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.807 is provided; and (e) the deposit will be replaced should it become necessary due to inviability, contamination, or loss of capability to function described in the manner in the specification. In either case, the identifying information set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.809(d) should be added to the specification if it is not already present. See 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.803-1.809 for additional explanation of these requirements.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 1646

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1, 3, 5-7 and 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Torigoe et al. (US 6,087,116).

Torigoe et al. disclose monoclonal antibody which binds a polypeptide claimed comprising amino acids 1-3 of SEQ ID NO:4 (columns 9-20). The antibody inherently has the neutralizing activity since it binds the polypeptide. The term "neutralizing activity" is not defined to exclude such limitations.

5. Claims 1, 3, 5-7 and 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mori et al. (US 7,193,033).

Mori et al. disclose monoclonal antibody which binds a polypeptide claimed comprising amino acids 1-3 of SEQ ID NO:4 (columns 4, 24-32, and 38-41). The

Art Unit: 1646

antibody inherently has the neutralizing activity since it binds the polypeptide. The term "neutralizing activity" is not defined to exclude such limitations.

6. No claim is allowed.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pak whose telephone number is 571-272-0879. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 2:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Nickol can be reached on 571-272-0835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Michael Pak/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1646

Application/Control Number: 10/557,351
Art Unit: 1646

Page 9